

REMARKS

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28 and 30 stand rejected under §102(b) on the basis of Fukui et al. '382. Independent claims 1, 2, 29 and 30 have been amended in light of this rejection, and applicants traverse the rejection because Fukui et al. '382 do not disclose (or suggest) a linear photodetector that has the light reflection portions of the present invention.

First, in Fukui et al., a panel-form illuminating system has a linear light source (4) and a planar photoconductor (1) (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 4), without a linear photodetector. On the other hand, in the present invention, a lighting apparatus includes a light source (12a, 12b), a linear photoconductor (14) and a planar photoconductor (16) (see Fig. 1A).

The examiner argues that the photoconductor (1) of Fukui et al. corresponds to the linear photoconductor (14) of the present invention, but the planar photoconductor (1) of Fukui et al. does not correspond to the linear photoconductor (14) of the present invention. The photoconductor (1) of Fukui et al. corresponds to the planar photoconductor (16) of the present invention.

Second, in the present invention, planes of the plural light reflection portions (20) of the linear photoconductor (14) are respectively tilted at a plurality of different angles according to the positions of the light reflection portions (20) so that the light exits substantially vertically to the longitudinal direction of the linear photoconductor (14). This feature of the present invention is not disclosed in the reference. In Fukui et al. '382, inclined surfaces (12, 13) are formed in the planar photoconductor (1), which is not the linear photoconductor (14) of the present invention.

Third, in the present invention, the direction of the light emitted from the planar photoconductor (16) is substantially perpendicular to a plane of the planar photoconductor (16) (see Fig. 8). In Fukui et al., the direction of light emitted from the photoconductor (1) is not taken into consideration.

In the present invention, since the planes of the plural light reflection portions of the linear photoconductor are respectively tilted at a plurality of different angles according to the positions of the light reflection portions, the light exits substantially vertically to the longitudinal direction of the linear photoconductor. Therefore, in the present invention, a direction of the light emitted from the planar photoconductor is substantially perpendicular to a plane of the planar photoconductor. Accordingly, in the present invention, it is possible to obtain a uniform light intensity distribution at a particular viewpoint. Therefore, in the present invention, it is possible to obtain good display characteristics.

Fukui et al. neither discloses nor suggests this feature of the present invention. In Fukui et al., the light emitted from the photoconductor (1) radiates in various directions. Therefore, in Fukui et al. a light intensity distribution at a viewpoint is not uniform. Accordingly, in Fukui et al. it is not possible to obtain the good display characteristics of the present invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 29 stand rejected under §103 on the basis of Fukui '054 and Epstein '539. Applicants traverse this rejection. Independent claims 1, 2, 29 and 30 have been amended to overcome this rejection, and applicants traverse for the following reasons.

First, applicants traverse this rejection for reasons given with respect to the previous rejection, i.e., the photoconductor (1) of Fukui et al. does not correspond to the linear photoconductor (14) of the present invention, but rather the planar photoconductor (16) of the present invention.

Second, in the present invention, planes of the plural light reflection portions (2) of the linear photoconductor (14) are respectively tilted at a plurality of different angles according to the

positions of the light reflection portions (20) so that the light emitted from the planar photoconductor (16) is converged on a viewpoint (see Fig. 3).

On the other hand, in Fukui et al., inclined surfaces (12, 13) are formed in the planar photoconductor (1), which does not correspond to the linear photoconductor (14) of the present invention. Furthermore, in Fukui et al. the direction of light emitted from the photoconductor (1) is not taken into consideration.

Epstein merely discloses a view 25 (viewpoint). Thus, neither reference discloses the linear photoconductor of the present invention, which is strong evidence of non-obviousness.

In the present invention, since the planes of the plural light reflection portions are respectively tilted at a plurality of different angles according to the positions of the light reflection portions so that the light emitted from the planar photoconductor is converged on the viewpoint, it is possible to obtain a uniform light intensity distribution at the viewpoint. Therefore, in the present invention, it is possible to obtain good display characteristics. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Patrick G. Burns

Registration No. 29,367

February 3, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
P:\DOCS\111\66277\424021.DOC